

No. ID/FD/39/82/36564.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the workman Shri. Bharat Singh and the management of Haryana Urban Development Authority, Division No. 3, Plot No. 3, Sector 9, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;—

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, constituted under section 7-A of the said Act, the matters specified below, being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Bharat Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The 10th August, 1982

No. ID/FD/115/82/36964.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the workman Shri. S. G. Panicker and the management of M/s Security Guards Corps (Regd). Plot No. 906, Sector 15, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to Labour Court, Faridabad, constituted,—*vide* Government Notification No. 11495/G-Lab/57/11245, dated 7th February, 1958, read with notification No. 5414/3Lab/68/15254, dated 20th June, 1968 under section 7 of the said Act, the matter specified below being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri S. G. Panicker was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

No. ID/FD/83/82/36971.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the workman Smt. Maya and the management of M/s. Sovrin Knit Works 20/4, Mathura Road, Faridabad regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, constituted under section 7-A of the said Act, the matters specified below, being either matter in dispute or matter relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Smt. Maya was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

No. ID/FD/83/82/36996.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is of the opinion that an Industrial Dispute exists between the workman Smt. Anar Devi and the management of M/s Sovrin Knit Works, 20/4, Mathura Road, Faridabad, regarding the matter hereinafter appearing;

And whereas the Governor of Haryana considers it desirable to refer the dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana hereby refers to the Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, constituted under section 7-A of the said Act, the matter specified below, being either matter in dispute or matters relevant to or connected with the dispute as between the said management and the workman for adjudication:—

Whether the termination of service of Smt. Anar Devi was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

V. S. CHAUDHRI,

Deputy Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour Department.